SPEECH OF MR. VINTON, OF OHIO,

On the Expenses of Collecting the Revenue.

House of Representatives, Feb. 8, 1850. The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the bill to regulate the expenses of collect-

ing the public Revenue-Mr. VINTON said that the act of 3d March, 1849, in

troduced a new system of paying for the expenses of collecting the revenue from the customs and the public lands.

Before that law went into effect the expenses of collecting the customs were paid by the collector out of the moneys received by him, and the residue or nett income only found its way into the public Treasury. By the act passed in March last, all moneys received from the customs and from all mis-cellaneous sources are directed, from and after the 1st of July, 1849, to be paid over into the Treasury; and it is made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury annually to submit estimates to Congress, to defray the expenses of collection, and on these estimates Congress is required to make specific appropriations to carry on this branch of the public service, which appropriations are drawn from the Treasury like all other moneys for other Departments of the Government.

Every branch of the public service has been heretofore pro vided for, and carried on by means of what are usually denominated specific appropriations made by Congress from year to year; in which every head and item of expenditure comes annually under the review of Congress, and such sum of money is appropriated for each specific object as Congress may deem expedient. In this way the whole expenditures of the public money come under the searching scrutiny of Con-gress, and it enables the legislative power to decide what rent. In this way the whole expenditures of trenchments or reforms are necessary in any department of the Government.

This has been the mode of appropriating for the Army, the Navy, the Judiciary, the Legislative and Post Office Departments. Till 1836 the Post Office was an exception to the general system, and its expenses were defrayed directly out of its income, without the money going into the Treasury. In that year this department was subjected to specific appropria-tions, founded on detailed estimates from the Postmaster General for that service. Since that time the expense of the collection of the customs and of the revenue from the public lands has formed the only exception to this general system. The act of the 3d of March, requiring the gross receipts of the customs and the public lands to be paid into the Treasury, and the expenses of managing them to be paid for by specific appropriations, has reduced the whole public expenditures to one uniform system. It is a most valuable law, and ought to have been passed long ago. But, while it brought the collections from the customs under the general system, the law proother branch of the public service, which is a provision that in no future year should the expenses of collecting the customs exceed the sum of \$1,560,000. When we consider the growing commerce of the country, the expansion of our set-tlements, and our new Territories to be settled, and the new and secumulated duties that are almost every year devolved on the collection service, it is, in principle, just as absurd to impose such a limit on it as it would be to enact that in all time to come the expenses of the army, the navy, or the Post Office Department should not exceed a specified amount. That limitation is now known to be insufficient, and Congress will be obliged immediately to recede from it, or the most disastrons consequences will result from it, to the great detriment

The joint resolution from the Senate now before us, and the amendment of it proposed by the Committee of Ways and Means, all have for their object to modify the effect of that limitation temporarily, and till the end of the present fiscal year, a little more than four and a half months hence. The adoption of either will amount to substantially the same thing. Instead of the sum of \$1,560,000, the joint resolution proposes to appropriate for this year a sum equal to the expenses of collecting the customs in the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1848. Under an impression, which arese from an error hereafter explained, the Committee of Ways and Means—believing that the expenses of collections incurred in the first half of the present fiscal year had considerably exexpenses of the year 1848, which were two millions one hundred and thirty two thousand dollars, so as in fact, instead of leaving half of this sum, to put only eight hundred and forty thousand dollars at the disposal of the Treasury Department for the last half of this year-proposed the amendment now pending, which is, to allow for the expenses of the last half of this year a sum equal to one half of the whole expenses of the year 1848. In the year 1848 the collection of the customs was confined to the Atlantic side of the continent. Since that we had added what will doubtless prove to be the very expensive districts of California and Oregon. The effect of the resolution as it came from e Senate, or of the amendment proposed by the Committee of Ways and Means, would be to compel a curtailment of the expenses for the residue of the year by a sum equal to all of the expenses incurred on the Pacific coast.

The amendment now offered by me proposes to except California and Oregon, so as to give the same sum for the Atlantic service that was expended in the same district of country two years ago. And the immediate question now before the committee is, whether the exception that I propose occeding to discuss this proposition I will answer a question that perhaps every gentleman has already put to himself: Why was this limitation on the expenditure engrafted on the act of 3d March last ? With your rmission, I will give its history. When the tariff bill of permission, I will give its instery.

1846 was under the consideration of the Committee of Ways and Means, the Secretary of the Treasury wrote a letter to much as relates to the expenses of collecting the revenues from the customs. It bears date on the 23d of February,

"In compliance with your request, I send you the detailed estimates under the proposed bill for reducing the defined heretofore transmitted. The nett revenue is estimated at \$23,9 7,403—the expenses of collection at \$1,515,605, being \$537,864 less than the fiscal year, notwithstanding the supposed increase of importation; but under the proposed bill that reduction of expenditures can and will be effected by this

The committee will notice that the Secretary uses the very strong and positive language, that, if his proposed tariff bill was passed, that reduction can and will be effected by this On the 16th of the next month, Mr. Walker again called

the attention of the Committee of Ways and Means to this subject, in a letter to their chairman, which is as follows : "SIR: In my letter of the 23d of February last to you the statement was made that the expense of collecting the revenue could be reduced \$537,864 below the expenditures of the last fiscal year. To ensure this result, I respectfully recommend that a clause be inserted in the new tariff bill limiting the expenses of collecting the revenue under that bill to sum not exceeding \$1,520,000."

"The sum expended in collecting the revenue is now almost exclusively within the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury; the payments are frequently made merely upon his written order, without the intervention of those checks appertaining to the liquidation of other accounts, and the payments are not regulated by specific appropriations made by law, as in other cases. In my opinion, the expenses incident to the collection of the revenue should be regulated by specific appropriations, and the payments made subject to the checks applicable to the settlement of other accounts. This great reform can only be introduced by the legislation of Congress; but if you think proper to require the co-operation of this but if you think proper to require the co-operation of this Department, it will be cheerfully granted."

The committee will bear in mind that the two objects proposed to be accomplished by the Secretary in this letter were, the saving of expenses in the collection of the revenue, and to provide for them by specific appropriations. To effect this latter object, he proffers his aid to the committee. It is hardly necessary to say that the Committee of Ways and Means were in favor of reforms so very desirable. He was informed by the chairman that his recommendations met the approba tion of the committee; and on the 25th day of May following he addressed another letter to the chairman, as follows .

"Sin: Having been informed by you that the suggestions made in my letter of the 15th of March last, so far as regarded the limitation of the expenses incident to the collection of the revenue, and the regulation of the same by law, met the approximately the same by law, met the approximately same by the same by law, met th

bation of the Committee of Ways and Mesns, I enclose a provision for carrying the suggestions into effect.

"This provision, it is believed, should be appended as a new section to the bill reported by the committee for reducing the duties on imports. It that bill should not become a law, and the provisions of the present tariff remain unaltered, the expenses incident to the collection of the revenue, including drawbacks, fishing bounties, and allowances, cannot with safety be limited to the sum now proposed by this Department."

The provision which he enclosed in that letter to carry into effect his former recommendations, and which he desired should be engrafted upon the tariff bill then pending, was in these words :

" Be it further enacted, That the amount to be disbursed in payment of the expenses incidental to the collection of the revenue shall not exceed in the whole, for the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1847, or for any fiscal year succeeding, the sum of one million five hundred and twenty thousand dollars. and that the Secretary of the Treasury shall have full power t the aggregate amount within the limitation above mentioned and that hereafter the whole gross amount of the public moneys by whomsoever received or collected, shall be paid into the freasury, and all expenses incident to the collection of the re venue, not exceeding the amount above stated, shall be paid out of any moneys in the Treasury not other wise appropriated, and the accounts thereof shall be rendered to the proper accounting officers of the Treasury for adjustment by them."

It is hardly necessary to say that this proposition was a total departure from his recommendation to provide for the expenses of collection by specific appropriations, to effect which be had proffered his sid to the Committee of Ways and

and retrenchment should be made. Instead of that, however, the proposition sent to the committee to be incorporated in the tariff bill, proposed to put the public money at his command by a standing and permanent indefinite appropriation, and would, had it become a law, have armed the Secretary of the Treasury with absolute power. He might have abolished collection districts, cut down all allowances provided for by law, and scattered the whole collection system to the winds, if he had been so disposed. The tariff bill became a law; but it is scarcely necessary to add that this proposition was not engrafted upon it. The Secretary seems to have imagined that the new tariff law would, in some way, cause a great reduction in the expenses of collection, but he does not explain how. The new tariff law went into operation on the 1st December, 1846. In his annual report to Congress, made in that mouth, he seems to have passed over the subject of the reduction of the expenses of collecting the revenue under the new tariff with-out notice. The act had become a law but a few days before, and of course he had not had time to make those savings which he seems to have thought could be effected under the new tariff. Having got the new law into operation, the Secretary applied himself to the business of reducing the expenses collection. I have no doubt he was sincerely desirous of success. A year passed away, during which time he had ample opportunity to study and understand the working of his favorite system of ad valorem duties, and to apply to it all the retrenchment of expense which was practicable. In his annual report on the state of the finances, presented in December, 1847, he made the following important announcement to Congress, to which I beg leave to call the particular attention of the committee. He says :

of the committee. He says:

"Diminishing expenses being one of the best means of improving the finances, the charges of collecting the revenue from customs have been carefully examined, and every retrenchment made compatible with the public interest. The saving thus effected, notwithstanding the vast increase of business, will amount, it is believed, to nearly \$500,000 per annum; not by reducing wages or reasonable compensation, but by dispensing with every officer or agent not absolutely required for the public service; by curtailing the expense of the revenue marine; by introducing a more rigid and perfect system of accountability; by classifying the expenditures and arranging them in tables under distinct heads; and, above all, by subjecting them to the same checks, under the supervision of the accounting to the same checks, under the supervision of the accounting officers of the Treasury, as apply to appropriations made by law, in regard to which Congress will, no doubt, be guided by that wise and enlightened economy so important at this time to the maintenance of the public credit."

Now, this is not a communication to Congress of what he now, this is not a communication to Congress of what he proposed to do, but a statement of what he had actually done; that he had made every retrenchment compatible with the public interest, by dispensing with every officer or agent not absolutely required for the public service; by curtailing the expenses of the revenue marine, &c. This report was referred. to the Committee of Ways and Means. Afterwards, a bill at all. If the Pacific service be not excepted, then a eduction must be made here on the Atlantic equal to the whole Means, on the motion of a gentleman not now a member of the House, (Mr. McKar.) then a member of the committee, is Treasury, and the expenses of collection paid for out of pecific appropriations founded on estimates to be furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury, and limited the expenditures to tent of that duty.

How much shall the Secretary retrench here to make gool and which provided that the gross revenue should be paid into ars. This sum was arrived at by deducting half a million of car. The statement of the Secretary of what he had done the way of retrenchment was received and acted upon by the committee as a fact officially verified. The bill passed the House about the middle of March, 1847, and remained in the Senate till the middle of August, when, on the adjournment of Congress, it was left in that body among its unfinished business. It remained in that body till the last day of the last session, when it was passed there, with some amendments of dates, to adapt it to the year that had expired since it left the House. These amendments were agreed to, in the confusion and haste that always attend the close of the session, without attracting any particular attention. Certain it is that I do not recollect any thing about it. It will be borne in mind that Mr. Secretary Walker made this report to Congress in the last month of the second quarter of the fiscal year which ended on the 30th of June, 1848. When, at the end of that year, the expenses of collection came to be footed up, it turnd out that, notwithstanding every retrenchment had been made by him compatible with the public interest, and every officer and agent dispensed with not absolutely required for the public service, instead of a reduc ion of half a million, the actual expenses of that year went beyond those of the preced-

The design and policy of this law was to require that all the moneys collected for the Government should be paid into the treasury and accounted for, and that none should be paid ut without the consent of Congress specially given. It is, as I have already said, a wise law, and ought to have been passed long ago. But the facts which I have stated prove onclusively that the limitation on the expenditures to the sum of \$1,560,000 per annum, was incorporated into the bill in consequence of a mistake into which the Secretary had fallen in assuming that he had made a reduction in the expense of collection, which the sequel showed he had not made, and could not make. I have not gone through with this detail of facts for the purpose of assailing the late Secretary; very far from that; but for the purpose of vindicating myself as one of the Committee of Ways and Means who agreed to this limitation, from any imputation of having acted in the matter without reliable information to stand upon. To say or insinuate here that Mr. Walker had commi Congress officially a fact which he knew to be untrue, would be to charge him with a high crime and misdemeanor. So far from that, I believe he was sincerely devoted to the public service, and I have no doubt he honestly believed this statement in his report to be correct. When he stated he had made this great reduction of near half a million, he did the result of his attempt at retrenchment.

I have gone through with this narrative, also, for the purpose of showing the true circumstances in which the present Secretary took possession of this branch of the public service. From which it must be apparent that every charge brought against the present incumbent for not effecting reductions will coil with equal and even greater force on his predecessor. But the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means comments in pretty strong terms on the supposed extraordinary expenditures of the present Secretary, in the first half of the present fiscal year over past expenses.

I admit, Mr. Chairman, that the facts in the possession of that gentleman, at the time he made his speech, justified him in saying that the expenses of this branch of the service had een increased in the first half of the year. At the same time, I trust, it is in my power to show that in fact there has been no real increase of expense, but only a nominal increase, growing out of the new system of keeping the accounts at he Treasury, to adapt them to the change made in the very law we now have under consideration. Under the old system, all moneys collected by the Government officers, for storage, cartage, &c., were paid out again by the collector without beng paid into the Treasury. The deficiency only, that is to ay, such sum only as the receip's from storage, cartage, &c. fell short of paying for this head of service, was paid out of the Treasury. And the deficiency so paid at the Treasury was all of the expense which the Treasury accounts showed to have

been incurred for this purpose.

Since the act of the 3d of March last went into effect, and for the first half of the present year, all the money received by the collector for storage, carrage, &c., is paid over into the Treasury, and the whole pay is drawn out of the Treasury to meet these expenses. Now, I am informed that the amount of storage, cartage, &c. is very large, some two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand dollars. All that is paid out for these objects, I have already said, now appears the Treasury accounts as expenses; but, to get at the true emparison of expense between this year and the preceding year, the sums received into the Treasury the present year must be deducted from the charge against the item. Taking out that and the supposed increase of warehousing expenses, and the estimated expenses for California, and the expenses of election this year are so far no greater, and probably less than last year. On the morning after the joint resolution had passed the Senate and come to the House, the Secretary of the 'reasury had directed the clerk having charge of this branch of the expenditures to furnish him with a statement of the expenses of collecting the revenue in the first half of the year, so that he might see how much the resolution left at his sposal for the second half. The clerk gave to the Secretary true statement, without adverting to the fact that this change had taken place in regard to this item of expenditure; nor do I know whether the clerk knew it was the Secretary's object o get a comparative statement. Be that as it may, the statement was taken as the true amount of expense for the first half of the year. Taking the sum of twelve hundred and ninety-four thousand dollars, which thus appeared to have been expended in the first half of this year, from the whole xpense in 1848, left only about the sum of eight hundred and forty thousand dollars for the residue of the year. The ecretary addressed a note to the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, informing him how much had been expended, and how much would remain under the Senate's re-

olution subject to his command; and upon that note the

amendment reported by the committee was predicated, and

had for its object to give him a sum for the second half of this

year equal to one-half of the whole expense of the year 1848. suppose that I might have known that the law required this change, but it did not occur to me any more than to the Secretary , and I presume it did not occur to the chairman, for, if so, his frankness and candor would have induced him to state it, instead of complaining of an actual increase of expenditure. I thought the chairman in his speech showed retty clearly that there had been an increase. I called on the Secretary for information. I knew that since the year 1844 there had been no increase of the number of inspectors except few added by law, perhaps, in 1816, to the number in New Orleans. I found, on inquiry, that the increase in the pay or emoluments of those employed in that branch of the serice would amount to a very inconsiderable part of such an ncrease-in fact almost a trifle. I requested that the items

turned out; the large item of expense, for storage, carlage, &c., charged the first half of this year, compared with the corresponding period last year, explained the whole difference. It also serves to explain the increased estimated expense for the next fiscal year, of which the chairman also &c., charged the first half of this year, compared with the corresponding period last year, explained the whole difference. It also serves to explain the increased estimated expense for the next fiscal year, of which the chairman also complained. The expense of that year is estimated at twenty-seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Now, if to the sum of two millions two hundred thousand, which were the expenses in 1848-9, there be added for storage, cartage, &c. say two hundred and fifty thousand; for the expenses in California two hundred and fifty thousand; for the expenses in California two hundred and fifty thousand; for the expenses in that under the head of expenses of collecting the revenue from customs they do not embrace all the charges that fall under that head in this country; and that, if you include there and dispensed with: and for increase of business in new disfor increase of warehousing by the Government, if that be not dispensed with; and for increase of business in new districts likely to be established at the present session, and we have the sum of twenty-seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars, without there being, in fact, any increase of expenditure in the old service.

[Mr. Disner here inquired what amount was paid out for storage in the first half of this year, and what in the first half

of the last.

Mr. Vinton said (in reply) that he was informed that the amount paid out in the first half of this year was about one hundred and eighty-one thousand dollars, and the amount paid has year should seventy-nine out in the corresponding period last year about seventy-nine

Mr. V. resumed, and said that he thought the explanation now given would be satisfactory, and therefore he should estow no further remarks upon it, but pass to another topic Mr. BAYLY here said that if he (Mr. VINTON) had any thing further to say on that topic, he wished him to say now, as he (Mr. B) should dispute his conclusion.

Mr. VINTON said, if the gentleman could not understan what he had now said, he despaired of enlightening him; that any one might deny that a twelve o'clock sun shined,

I will now, Mr. Chairman, ask the attention of the committee for a short time to the particular proposition offered by me; that is, to except California and Oregon from being included in the sum allowed, so as to make the resolution a pro-vision for the Atlantic service only. And in the first place, from what I have already said, I shall assume that there can be no material reduction in the expenses of the service here without serious injury to the commerce of the country, and also to the revenue. There is in California and Oregon a state of things that is above and stronger than all our laws; we cannot control it, if we would. We shall be obliged, during the present excited state there, to take the Pacific service out of our general system. For nothing can be plainer than that if we attempt to limit the service there to the same compensation we give here, the result will be that the cusexpense there. Now, who can undertake will be? Can the chairman or any one else do it? I answer no. Besides, an inborn sense of justice in the bosom of

the expense there? If he reduce too much, he will be charged dollars from the expenses of collection in the previous fiscal with having done a wanton injury to the public service; if the law commanded. Besides, what directions or orders can he convey to California after this resolution shall pass in time to be of any avail to him in this business of reduction, much less can he get any information from there? Let the service go on here on the Atlantic for the next four or five months to the distribution of the convey to California after this resolution shall pass in time to be of any avail to him in this business of reduction, much less can he get any information from there? Let the service go on here on the Atlantic for the next four or five months to of the action of Congress upon it, has been greatly exaggerated to the convey to California after this resolution shall pass in time to be a service when the service is always have been conducted and the convey to California after this resolution shall pass in time shall be guided.

Before doing so, bowever, I must be permitted to say that, in my opinion, the importance, not of the question itself, but of the action of Congress upon it, has been greatly exaggerated to the convey the service and the convey to call the principles by which I shall be guided.

Before doing so, bowever, I must be permitted to say that, in my opinion, the importance, not of the question itself, but of the action of Congress upon it, has been greatly exaggerated to the convey the pass of the convey to convey the convey mates for the next year, and decide on what basis to establish the service. The whole amount involved in this resolution is the difference of expense on the footing it has always stood upon, and that which will be saved in a half year by this new forced system of reduction. It must at best be but a very small saving. It is in very truth the farce of "Much Ado sir, upon the good sense of the committee to adopt the amendment now proposed.

I now pass, for a moment, to another topic. It never was

tary of the Treasury should undertake to revise the collection service. He is only to submit detailed estimates, and it is limitation of the expenditures having taken effect, and Congress having delayed to do any thing, he has been reluctantly

Every thing has been thrown into confusion in New York, and in the other great commercial cities. A day or two since I saw the collector for the city of New York, who gave me a full and detailed account of the effect already produced in the business community there; and, without going into any repetition of his statements, which my time will not allow, ply with the law, which requires one or more inspectors to placed on each vessel, that in some instances one inspector was obliged to have the charge of several. New, this leads directly to encourage importations with false invoices, to smuggling, and all sorts of frauds. What, sir, is the use smuggling, and which collect little or no revenue, if you open a so much better door for it in the city of New York, or in Boston? In regard to this crime, our people have thus far been proverbially a moral community; but, sir, if you once open a door for it, and force them into smuggling; if they once taste the sweets of an illicit trade, and the public mind be thereby demoralized, you may not find it a very easy thing to eradicate it here more than elsewhere. Sir, I warn you against that

But I must hasten to another topic. The chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, to avoid the effect of the objection, that the Secretary of the Treasury ought not to undertake this system of retrenchment, because in his action he must confine himself to those parts of the service over which he has a discretion, and cannot change or abolish those parts of it which are established by law, while Congress has p over all, controverts this position, and maintains that, since the act of the 3d of March last limits the expenditure to \$1,560,000, therefore, by necessary implication, he has a power over the whole service, as well that regulated by staute as that confided to his discretion. Speaking of salaries, he says: "I know it is supposed he cannot touch these. It is said their salaries are regulated by law. I do not concur in this opinion. When the law of the 3d of March, 1849, passed, requiring the Treasury Department to reduce the expenses of collecting the revenue to \$1,560,000, it neces sarily gave the Secretary the authority to do it. His discretion as to the mode of reduction was unlimited."

Mr. BAYLY requested Mr. VINTON to read the next para-Mr. VINTON. "Suppose (continues Mr. BAYLY) the sa-laries of all the officers of the customs had been fixed by law prior to the 3d of March, 1849, could it be said, therefore,

that it was inoperative? That the last law would be con-trolled and modified by those which preceded it?" Mr. VINTON said this sounded as though we were back gain under the old dispensation. It had been the fashion for many years post to set up extravagant constructions in favor of Executive authority—freely to claim for the Executive legislative powers, and still more freely to exercise them. He had hoped to hear no more of this; that the change of Administration, if it did nothing else, would leave Congress to enjoy unmolested its proper function of legislation, and that contro over the policy of the country which the constitution vested in this Department of the Government. Sir, the Secretary is to lay estimates before Congress, and they are to make the appropriations. To assume that this limitation unsettles th whole system of laws regulating the collecting service is to beg the question. If, as the gentleman says, his discretion be unlimited as to the mode of reduction of the expense, and gave him control over all salaries fixed by law before that time. what is there to hinder him from getting at the reduction in a much shorter and more effective way? Out of the 110 o 112 collection districts in this country, there are something like ninety of them that in the aggregate collect but little more revenue than to pay the expense of maintaining them. Sup pose the Secretary puts his hand on them and abolishes the whole of them; or, what is more, in the exercise of this pretended unlimited authority, he should abilish the district of New York itself? This would bring him down to the limit at a single blow. All of these are established by prior laws.

If a district be protected from the hand of the Secretary, is it tablished by law, does it rest on any other or less solid foun-

alaries, and said he would show very few of them had them. Mr. VINTON said that some of them had salaries and others and fees fixed by law; and that, where a fee was fixed by law, it could no more be touched than a salary. But, sir, I am discussing a question of principle and power, started by the What has it to do with the question of power, whether there are few or many cases falling within it

The gentleman undertook to show that the collection ser ce in this country was extravagant compared with the cost of like service in other countries. He drew a comparison in particular between this country and Great Britain. He complains especially of New York, where the expense of collection is only about four per cent. What will the gentleman do (if the rate of expenditure is to be the cuterion to decide whether the service be economical or not) with nearly every Means. Specific appropriations would have brought every branch of the collection service under the review of Congress, and enabled it to decide where and to what extent reductions a trills. I requested that the items would not be expensed to the Committee of Ways and increase—in fact simost a trills. I requested that the items would not be expensed in a trills. I requested that the increase—in fact simost a trills. I requested that the increase in fact simost a trills. I requested that the increase in fact simost a trills. I requested that the increase in fact simost a trills. I requested that the increase in fact simost a trills. I requested that the increase in

probably lead to a clue to explain what was wanted. It so will be do with the Cherrystone district, in which, I believe, which is indispensable to the security of the South and to to do this not only by every principle of justice and humanit the gentleman lives, and where the expense of collection, in-stead of being four per cent., as in New York, is two or three

all the expenses charged here, the expense of collection there would not probably fall short of seven and a half per cent. I doubt whether there is any country where the service is done

cheaper than here.

Mr. Bayly here requested Mr. Vinton to name one charged to the expense of the collection service here and not charged under that head there.

Mr. Vinton said that head in Great Britain did not em-

brace their warehouse expenses, which that year were some one hundred and sixty-odd thousand pounds, he believed. One of Mr. Walker's letters, which was read at the Clerk's desk, shows that to this head, in this country, fishing bounties, drawbacks, and allowances are charged. But the book I now hold in my hand shows a similar list of payments there, which are not included under the head of expenses of collecting the revenue. Besides, let it be borne in mind, when we make the comparison between the two countries, that in the United Kingdom in the year ending in January, 1848, the gross revenue from customs was, when converted into our currency, equal to about one hundred and six millions of dollars, while our customs yielded not to exceed one-third of that amount. Now, it is perfectly apparent that if in our present districts one hundred and six millions of dollars were collected, the rate of the expenses of collection would be greatly reduced; and hence in London, where most money is collected in England, the rate of cost is the least, and for the same reason New ork costs the least per cent. of any district in this country.

Mr. VINTON, before the close of his argument, was cut of

the expiration of the allotted hour.

Mr. Butlen, of Pennsylvania, moved that the gentleman ve leave to close his remarks. Mr. Barry hoped the permission would be allowed.

The Charn said it could only be granted by unanimous

A brief conversation followed. Objection was made.

So Mr. VINTON was not allowed to proceed.

SPEECH OF MR. C. M. CONRAD. OF LOUISIANA. ON THE TERRITORIAL QUESTION.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 28, 1850. Mr. CONRAD addressed the committee as follows : Mr. CONKAD addressed the committee as londer.

Mr. Chairman: So many gentlemen have preceded me in
this debate, and the discussion has taken so wide a range,
that I do not rise with the hope or expectation of presenting

the expense there? If he reduce too much, he will be charget with having done a wanton injury to the public service; it too little, then he will be assailed because he did not do what the question before us is one in which my constituents feel deeply interested, and I consider it due both to them and to the law commanded. Besides, what directions or orders can the convey to California after this resolution shall ease in time.

the end of this year, as it always has been conducted; and ted. Any one who would witness the heat and excitement the end of this year, as it always has been conducted; and in the mean time Congress can take up and act on the estimates for the next year, and decide on what basis to establish the service. The whole amount involved in this resolution is the difference of expense on the footing it has always stood gion of country which we acquired from Mexico, would depend upon the result of our deliberations. But such is not the fact. Sir, there is a law-maker whose power is supreme whose decrees cannot be controlled by human enactments. About Nothing;" while, from what I am told of the effects of what has already been done to the merchants and business men of the country, it is to them a veritable tragedy. I rely, adapted to slavery, slavery will assuredly find its way there try, its climate, its soil, its position, its productions, it is adapted to slavery, slavery will assuredly find its way thereany thing we may say or do to the contrary notwithstanding. If, on the contrary, it be not adapted to slavery—if slaves would be unprofitable there, then no legislation could permater of the 3d March last that the Secretary of the Treasury should undertake to region the collection. may enact in regard to this territory would become inoperative as soon as the country ceased to be under our control. the proper business of Congress to make such reforms as it and that as soon as State Governments are organized there, may deem politic and expedient; but in consequence of this they would in this, as in all other matters, be governed by

their own views of their own interests.

Now, sir, I must candidly confess that I have long since ome reluctantly to the conclusion that Nature has decided this question against the South. What is the general character of this country? Why, sir, if the map of the world were spread before you, I doubt whether you could place your finger on a spot of the habitable globe where, in an equal extent of territory, there is so small a proportion of fertile, or even cultivable soil. All accounts concur in representing it as a land of rocks and of deserts, of arid plains and snow to be taken at their invoice; that instead of being able to com- for want of sustenance and water. In order to show that this picture is not overcharged, allow me to read a brief extract from a work prepared, I believe, under the direction of the War Department, and published by order of Congress. I mean the notes of a military reconnoissance from Fort Leavenworth, in Missouri, to San Diego, in California, by Lieut. not intend to deceive Congress, but was himself deceived as to of your collection districts, whose only office is to prevent | Col. W. H. Emory. At pp. 98 and 99 of this work, we read the following passage:

"The country, from the Arkansas to this point, more than 1,200 miles, in its adaptation to agriculture, has peculiarities which must forever stamp itself upon the population which inhabits it. All of North Mexico, embracing New Mexico, Chihuahua, Sonora, and the Culifornias, as far north as the Sacramento, are, as far as the best information goes, the same in the physical character of its surface, and differ but little in climate or products. mate or products.
"In no part of this vast tract can the rains from heaven be

relied upon, to any extent, for the cultivation of the soil. The earth is destitute of trees, and in great part also of any vege-"A few feeble streams flow in different directions from the great mountains, which in many places traverse this region. These streams are separated, sometimes by plains, and sometimes by mountains, without water and without vegetation, and may be called deserts, so far as they perform any useful

part in the sustenance of animal life.
"The cultivation of the earth is, therefore, confined to those parrow strips of land which are within the level of the waters of the streams, and wherever practised in a community with any success, or to any extent, involves a degree of subordina-tion, and absolute obedience to a chief, repugnant to the habits

of our people.
"The chief who directs the time and the quantity of the precious irrigating water must be implicitly obeyed by the whole community. A departure from his orders, by the waste of water, or unjust distribution of it, or neglect to make the proper embankments, may endanger the means of subsistence of many people. He must, therefore, be armed with power to punish properties and invasidated. punish promptly and immediately.
The proats of labor are too inadequate for the existence

of negro slavery. Slavery, as practised by the Mexicans, un-der the form of peonage, which enables their master to get the services of the adult while in the prime of life, without the obligation of rearing him in infancy, supporting him is old age, or maintaining his family, affords no data for estimating the profits of slave labor, as it exists in the United States.

"No one who has ever visited this country, and who is account the state of the

minted with the character and value of slave labor in the dunted with the character and value of slave labor in the United States, would ever think of bringing his own slaves here with any view to profit, much less would be purchase slaves for sich a purpose. Their labor here, if they could be retained as slaves, among prons, nearly of their own color, would never repay the cost of transportation, much less the additional purchase money."

This, sir, is the opinion of an intelligent and scientific officer, formed upon personal observation of the country; and this opinion is confirmed by all I have ever read or heard of

If this opinion be correct, it would be about as easy to intro duce the culture of the cotton and sugar plants on the parched plains and the snow covered mountains of this country, as permanently to establish slavery there. For these reasons, from the moment that the acquisition of this territory was firs suggested-from the moment that the cry "of indemnity for past and security for the future" first went forth from the White House, and was caught up and re-echoed as a war-cry by a powerful party in this country, I was satisfied that this "indemnity" would be no indemnity, this "security" any-thing but a security to the South; and I said then, I have ever since said, and I say now, that I would willingly give Mexico twice as much to take back the country as it cost us. Even the discovery of the gold region in California did not reconcile me to the acquisition; for experience has shown that ot because it is established by law? And if a salary be es- it matters little who owns the sail that contains the precious metals, or by whose hands they are excavated, as they will oltimately find their way where the ever-rolling tide of commerce carries them. In fact, the history of Spain, when she possessed nearly all the gold and silver mines in the world, and in more modern times, of Mexico herself, prove that the country that owns the mines often gets the smallest portion

of their products.

The only portion of this territory that we did need was harbor or two on the Pacific, which might have been purchased at a trifl ng cost, and the government of which would not have exposed the country to all the agitation and excitement which this question has produced.

But we are told by gentlemen from the North, as an

But we are told by gentlemen from the North, as an excuse for the pertinacity with which they adhere to their purpose, that a great principle is involved in the question. True, sir, there is a principle involved in it, an important principle; but it is a principle in the preservation of which the Seuth is more directly interested than the North. That principle is the principle of the preservation of the principle in the preservation of which the Seuth is more directly interested than the North.

which is indispensable to the security of the South and to the harmony of the Union. All that is demanded by the South is, that this principle should remain inviolate. We do not ask that Congress should so legislate as to force slavery into this Territory invità naturà, and sgainst the wishes of its inhabitants. All that we ask, all that we insist on is, that you should not interpose your authority to prevent slavery ry from being introduced into the country, or to abolish it if, a as some suppose, it already exists there. Is there any thing unjust or unreasonable in this demand?

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, deny that Congress has the constitutional power to interfere in this matter; and, even if they shad the constitutional, I deny that they have the moral power.

But do this not only by every principle of justice and humanity, but by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by an express provision of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalbut by which we acquired it: the 9th article of which stipulates that, until the inhabitants of this country are incorporated into the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected in the Union, "they shall be maintained and protected

had the constitutional, I deny that they have the moral power.

I shall not undertake to examine at length the question whether Congress possesses the power to establish Territorial Governments, and if it has, what are the proper limits of that power. The time to which by the rules of the House I am compelled to limit my remarks would prevent my doing so even if I deemed it advisable. But this task has been so often performed by abler men that I would consider it a work of su-

pererogation to attempt it.

I will observe, however, that few constitutional lawyers of the present day who affirm the existence of this power would venture to base this affirmation on that provision of the constitution where it has been usually sought, viz. Art. 4, sec. 3d, tution where it has been usually sought, viz. Art. 4, sec. 3d, which empowers Congress "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." If any doubt remained on this point, it has been removed by the able speech recently delivered by a distinguished Senator from Michigan, (Mr. Cass.) who has clearly shown that this clause in the constitution does not even afford a decent pretext for the exercise of the power. I differ from that gentleman in many important questions, but I take this opportunity to declare that. portant questions, but I take this opportunity to declare that, for the independent stand he has taken on this question, and the ability with which he has maintained it, he deserves the gratitude and respect not of the South only, but of every friend

I am aware, sir, that this power has been sought for by some in other clauses of the constitution. Some have affirmed that the power to govern territory was a necessary consequence of the power to acquire it. But when they are asked where the power to acquire territory is found, they say that is also a necessary consequence of the power "to de-clare war." Thus, sir, one of the most important prerogactare war. Thus, sir, one of the most important preroga-tives of this Government, the power to govern at discretion, and for an unlimited period, a country far exceeding in ex-tent the thirteen original States, is made the consequence of a consequence—the derivative of a derivative.

Gentlemen whose opinions are entitled to respect have de-

Gentlemen whose opinions are entitled to respect have de-rived this power from other sources, but I have always thought that their arguments proved little except the ingenuity of those that used them. Is it probable indeed that, in an instrument so carefully framed, so deliberately discussed, as the constitution of the United States, if it had been intended to convey a power so important as the one in question, it would not have been done directly and in plain unequivocal language? Is it probable that it would have been suffered to lurk in an am biguous phrase, to be inferred from other powers, or to be formed like a a piece of patchwork, by stitching together de-tached portions of the constitution? I do not believe it. I believe it is a casus omissus, occasioned probably by the fact that at the time the constitution was adopted the General Government owned no territory except the northwest, the government of which was already provided for by the compact between the State of Virginia and the Confederation, which compact was ratified and confirmed by article six of the constit

It is urged that this power has been so often exercised that

it is treed that this power has dealed it is now too late to deny its existence.

No one has more respect for well-established precedents than I have. The maxim "stare decisis" is more important, when applied to interpretations of the fundamental law which defines the powers and prescribes the duties of government, than when applied to merely municipal laws which regulate the rights and duties of individuals. But this maxim is less applicable to legislative than to judicial decisions. Now, in this matter, although there are some decisions which seem to recognise the existence of the power, there is none which directly affirms it.

Even the Congressional precedents are by no means con-clusive. In the case of Missouri, it was settled by compromise, and in the case of Oregon, the country being confessed

ly not adapted to slavery, it excited little interest.

I conclude, therefore, that the power to establish a Territorial Government is nowhere to be found in the constitution. But does it follow from this circumstance that Congress is absolutely without power to provide any government what-ever for a territory owned by the United States? I think not. Whenever in a judicial proceeding it is discovered that great mischief or great injustice would result from the want of power to do a thing, tribunals, in the exercise of a sound discretion, frequently decide that it must be done ex necessitate rei-from the necessity of the case. So in countries governed by a constitution, particularly a written constitution—which furnishes an inflexible rule of conduct—the Gov-ernment often finds it necessary to exercise powers which, though not warranted by any express provision of the consti-tution, are nevertheless in accordance with its general spirit and object. The British ministry not unfrequently exercise the result of it was an expression of a firm conviction in his capied mountains—a large portion of which is utterly uninmind, which he authorized me to state on this floor, that if matters were left there in their present plight for a tweive month, it would be attended with a loss of revenue to the Government of more than a million of dollars. He stated destitute of animal and vegetable life, that the hardy pioneer of the plea was, to say the least, extremely questionable. I hold that there is less danger in a Government's assuming power admitted not to belong to it, whenever, by the exercise of such powers, a great national object will be attained or a great national calamity averted, than to seek to justify usurpation of power by perverting the language of the stitution from its plain and obvious import.

Now, sir, to apply these principles. The Government is in possession of an extensive region of country. The soil forms a part of its domain. It has the undoubted right to dispose of it, and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting it," considered as property; but it has no ex-press power to govern the inhabitants of this territory. Must be left to govern themselves as they see fit, or must they be left in a state of anarchy? No, the first course would deeat the rights of the Government ; the second would be contrary both to morals and to humanity. It is clear, then, that upon the principle of self-preservation the Government may stablish laws over a people so situated. But the necessity which is the origin of this power must be the measure of its extent. In order to ascertain what we rightfully may do, we

must ascertain what is absolutely necessary to be done. Now, it is clear that it is not at all necessary for us to dictate a permanent organic law to the inhabitants of a Territory. It is not necessary permanently to establish or to force upon them a system of domestic polity which, however it may please us, may be very unsuitable or unpalatable to them. not necessary to convert a Territory into a corpus vile, to make all sorts of political experiments upon. It is not necessary to force the inhabitants to adopt our peculiar notions of philanthropy or morality any more than our peculiar tenets of eligion; and we have no more right to prohibit the institution of slavery in a Territory than we have to prohibit the institution of marriage. All that is requisite for the protection of the inhabitants and of our own interests, and, consequent-, all that we have the power to do, is to make a few simple wide in due time for the legal and regular adoption, by the inhabitants, of such a system of government as they may pre-fer, with the single restriction that it be republican in its form. This is all that is necessary to be done, and therefore all that we have a right to do. The constitution confers on us no power to do more, and there is no necessity to warrant the ssumption of the power.

But, sir, suppose that I am in error on this point. Suppose you have the constitutional power to prohibit slavery in Territory : have you, in the present instance, the moral power? In other words, is it right, is it fair, is it honest, hat you should exercise the power?

This territory was acquired, partly by war, partly by purchase. It was won by the valor and paid for with the treasure of the whole country. What right, therefore, has any portion of the country to assume the entire control and management of it? What right has it to impose any restrictions r limitations upon the full and free enjoyment of it by the ther portion? Either this country is adapted to slavery, or other portion it is not. If it be adapted to slavery, the prohibition is obviously an injury, not only to all the States in which slavery exists, but to the inhabitants of the territory itself. If, on the other hand, it be not adapted to slavery, then the prohibition is worse than an injury; it is a wanton, unprovoked, gratui-tous insult; and, permit me to say, that a generous and highpirited people may forgive and forget an injury, but an insult they cannot overlook.

Men of the North, is there any principle that requires you to inflict upon us this injury or to offer us this insult?

No, there is none. There can be none. What is the true principle. What is the principle that you ought to contend for? It is, that you should not interfere at all in this matter. It is, that the people of these Territories be left to determine the question of slavery and all other questions of purely domestic policy according to their own views of their own interest. This is not a Southern or a Northern principle. It is an American principle. It is the principle of the right of man to self-government—a principle proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and consecrated in every line of the

Sir, it is true that this country is a conquered country, bu the people who are destined to occupy it are not a conquered race. No, they will be, for the most part at least, emigrants from the United States—men who have been nurtured at the br. as's of American mothers—who have imbibed the feelings and the principles of American fathers, and who, depend will claim to exercise all the rights of American civi

zens. They will therefore indignantly repel any attempt on your part to interfere with their domestic institutions. If these positions be correct, it was clearly the duty of the last Congress to establish Territorial Government over this country. And if it was their duly then, it is equally our duty now. We are bound to afford the inhabitants of this country protection for their lives and property. We are bound

not this demand shall be acceded to.

Before examining this question, allow me to say a few words in relation to the manner in which this constitution has been adopted. Several gentlemen on the other side have severely censured the people of California for daring to adopt a constitution without having been authorized by Congress to do so. It has been called an act of rebellion, of revolution, a pronunciamiento, and the President of the United States, for having countenanced, or not having opposed this unwarrantable proceeding, has been charged with being particeps criminis, and with having actually headed a rebellion against himself.

In relation to this charge I shall merely state, that that is a very strange revolution which consists, not in overturning an established Government, but in establishing one where none existed before, and that that is a singular rebellion which consists, not in opposing or resisting a Government, but, on the contrary, in tendering an immediate and voluntary submission

contrary, in tendering an immediate and voluntary submission to it, in swearing allegiance to it, and in soliciting to be allowed to participate in its administration.

In my opinion, sir, the people of California have acted wisely in preferring a government, however irregularly constituted, to no government at all; and the President, in afstituted, to no government at all; and the President, in af-fording every encouragement to the accomplishment of this object, has done no more than his duty.

It has been more than insinuated by several gentlemen over the way that not only was this Convention gotten up by direction of the President, but that the constitution was dic-

It might be considered a sufficient answer to this charge to state that it is entirely unsupported by evidence, whether in the official documents that have been laid before us, or in the unofficial accounts we have received from that country. But

we need not be satisfied with negative proof; we have evidence of a positive character.

As regards the origin of this plan, candor compels me to As regerus the origin of this plan, cancor compets me to say that the merit of originating it belongs exclusively to the late Administration, and that it is one of the few wise and judicious measures for which the country is indebted to it. This is clearly shown by the official documents transmitted to us by the President, and is confirmed by private accounts.

As regards any interference by the President in the deliberations of the Convention that framed the constitution, it is denied both by himself, by the gentleman through whom this influence is said to have been exerted, and, I am told, by the gentlemen who have been chosen Senators and Representa-tives, most, if not all, of whom were members of the Con-

And now, let me ask how it is that the President should have had sufficient influence to get up this Convention and to prescribe to them what sort of a constitution they should adopt, and yet not be able to procure the election of a single member in either House favorable to his administration? I leave to gentlemen who have more ingenuity than I possess to reconcile

this discrepancy.

I have no doubt, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the Convention that framed this constitution was fairly convened, and that the constitution itself was fairly adopted: at all events, it was ratified by an overwhelming majority of the people of California, (I believe more than 12,000 out of 13,000.) If, liforia, (I believe more than 12,000 out of 13,000.) If, therefore, it contain no provisions contrary to the constitution or laws, or to the rights and interests of the United States, I am perfectly willing they should live under it, at least until we shall have provided them with a government.

But the question now arises, shall California be admitted into the Union with this constitution? This is a very different question from the first one. Whether California shall be resmitted to cover because the state of the constitution.

be permitted to govern herself is one thing-whether she shall be permitted in part to govern us is another, and quite a dif-ferent thing. Let us remember, in the first place, that this is not a question between California and the United States, but entirely between the States themselves, and to be decided exclusively with reference to our interest and convenience. California has unquestionably no right to demand an admission into this Union. We are under no obligation, we have given no pledge, either expressed or implied, to admit her. There is in fact no such organized or political body as California and Mariana and that name which fornia There was a Mexican province of that name which we have acquired; and since its acquisition by us multitudes adventurers have flocked to it, not only from the United States, but from Europe, from South America, from Mexico, from the islands in the Pacific, and even from the opposite continent of Asia, who have taken possession of the country, and are helping themselves very unceremoniously to all the gold they can pick up. We have, with a liberality unparalleled, permitted this; but does it follow that on that account we are bound to confer on this promiscuous multitude any political powers or privileges? Have they any right to complain if we refuse to do this? Are we not sufficiently liberal when, after they have gorged themselves with gold, we permit them either to return to their respective homes or to remain in the

Viewing the question, then, as one to be decided exclusively with reference to our own interests, I ask the gentle-men who advocate the admission of California to inform us what possible advantage we will derive from her admission What end will be promoted by it? Are we not competen to govern ourselves, without the aid of California? e yet to hear the first argument in favor of this measure,

and there are many against it.
In the first place, all must admit that the proceedings by which this constitution was adopted were, to say the least, extremely irregular. The Convention that framed it, not being authorized by Congress, had no legal existence; and the constitution adopted by it is, so far as we are concerned, a blank piece of paper. They have adopted such boundaries for their State as suited their pleasure. Is any one here pre-pared to say whether those boundaries are such as we ought o approve?

The Constitution of the United States (art. 1, sec. 2) de-

clares, that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, and provides for an enumeration of the inhabitants of each State, with a view to this apportionment. No enumeration has been made of the population of California. Is any one here prepared to say that she has a population of actual bona fide residents sufficient to entitle her to admission as a State? If there be, he has been more fortunate in obtaining information than I have been : for I have sought to obtain it, and the accounts I receive are very contradictory. My own opinion is, that she has not that population. At all ewents, if such be the fact, we have no evidence of it. Thus, sir, we are called upon to admit into the Union a country of yesterday ; to give her as much weight in the other House as the largest State in this Union, and as much weight in this body as some of the smallest, without any evidence whatever that her population is sufficient to ectitle her to admission; we are called upon to allow her two Representatives, when it is exceedingly doubtful whether she be entitled to one. We are called upon not laws to protect them in the enjoyment of "life, liberty, and property;" to establish tribunals to enforce those laws, and to only to put her upon an equality with the other States, but to give her a preference over them, since we assign her a larger representation than she is entitled to. I cannot consent to do this. I might overlook matters of form, but I cannot sanctien a proceeding which, in my opinion, would be a violation of every principle and a departure from every precedent rela-ting to the admission of States into the Union, and their representation on this floor.

Why is it that certain gentlemen manifest such extreme

are impatient of the ordinary forms of legislation that retard her entrance? Why is it that they will not await the salam-nities of marriage, but rush with indecent haste into the ille-gitimate embraces of their favorite? How comes it that those very gentlemen who have heretofore pertinaciously opposed every attempt to give California a Territorial Government are now striving to convert her suddenly into a sovereign State of this Confederacy? Sir, I can tell you why it is. It is because her constitution contains a clause of about four lines—a clause prohibiting slavery. If the constitution had contained a provision of an opposite character; if it had tolerated instead subject, these same gentlemen would have been found opposing her admission as vehemently as they are now advocating it. if I oppose her admission into the Union it is not because she has prohibited slavery within her borders. I recognise to the has prohibited slavery within her botters. I recognise to the fullest extent the right of her people to regulate this matter according to her own wishes. I have no doubt that if the question were again submitted to the people their decision would be the same, and the longer the vote is postponed the more decisive it will be, from the fact that nine-tenths of the persons who emigrate to that country will always be from for-sign countries, or from non-slaveholding States of this Union. Some gentlemen suppose that the immediate admission of California would tend to calm the excitement growing out of this question. But this is a fatal mistake. My opinion is

that it would produce the very opposite result. Suppose a quarrel to have arisen between two men about the division of a loaf, and one were first to appropriate one half of it to him-self and then prepare to struggle for the remaining half, would such a proceeding tend to promote a fair division or ar amicable settlement ? If parties cannot agree upon a fair comromise of the question with an equality of votes in the Senate, is it probable that an addition of two votes to one side would make the party that received this addition to its strength nore apt to listen to reasonable terms? I think not.

If, therefore, the admission of California is proposed as a distinct and isolated measure, unconnected with any other as a counterpoise, I shall vote against it; but if it were made the basis of a compromise, if it were effered as one of several conditions, (whether embraced in one bill or in several is immaterial,) looking to a full, fair, and honorable settlement of the question, I would cheerfully waive my objections to the measure. But I want the whole question growing out of this new-